

**Table C-111a. Federal obligations for R&D plant for selected agencies, by State:
fiscal years 1992-2000**

[Dollars in millions]

Page 1 of 2

State	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Total	2,962.9	3,054.5	2,196.2	2,210.8	1,736.6	1,891.1	1,809.8	2,042.3	4,489.3
Alabama	346.1	368.2	94.1	44.1	48.9	43.4	38.6	66.6	210.6
Alaska8	1.0	88.0	1.4	.2	3.0	.0	.0	.3
Arizona	7.9	16.9	20.8	42.7	3.0	1.9	7.5	1.1	4.1
Arkansas	4.4	3.3	3.9	3.9	12.5	14.1	18.5	3.0	3.2
California	356.1	469.6	209.5	414.0	341.2	418.9	426.4	467.7	503.0
Colorado	55.6	30.0	36.9	31.2	28.4	52.6	63.3	43.2	34.6
Connecticut	2.6	14.4	3.8	5.2	3.6	5.2	2.6	2.3	91.0
Delaware1	2.1	1.1	1.9	2.0	2.4	.8	1.1	.3
District of Columbia	17.8	13.3	11.2	3.0	4.6	7.0	13.2	53.7	30.0
Florida	143.1	73.5	101.7	40.6	65.3	66.1	66.4	56.2	238.3
Georgia	6.4	3.5	5.3	12.4	4.6	5.2	3.8	8.5	9.2
Hawaii	6.5	19.3	14.3	.5	1.7	3.0	1.5	9.3	1.8
Idaho	39.6	27.4	12.5	8.9	19.2	26.2	11.5	8.2	27.2
Illinois	183.9	201.6	208.5	190.0	147.3	134.3	152.6	151.5	143.1
Indiana	8.4	22.6	4.1	4.8	15.2	7.9	3.1	6.7	12.2
Iowa	5.2	7.9	10.1	15.5	10.1	8.9	7.2	6.2	8.1
Kansas	2.5	10.1	10.6	1.2	1.5	1.4	.6	4.0	3.0
Kentucky0	.0	3.9	4.7	2.4	.4	.0	.1	2.6
Louisiana	26.2	29.5	21.0	21.5	26.5	18.6	30.4	28.8	11.7
Maine	1.5	1.0	1.9	.7	.2	.3	1.6	1.5	1.5
Maryland	229.7	264.6	196.2	390.3	240.2	299.6	304.2	302.2	352.4
Massachusetts	20.2	22.3	15.8	23.1	14.1	12.1	10.7	20.3	41.6
Michigan	9.1	21.7	4.5	3.7	6.3	5.0	3.0	5.9	5.9
Minnesota	2.5	3.0	17.2	5.1	6.3	2.6	3.5	7.2	3.7
Mississippi	41.6	42.2	31.9	36.5	32.8	38.8	47.6	26.8	20.7
Missouri	1.7	1.5	4.7	4.6	4.4	5.7	4.0	1.8	3.1
Montana	2.7	1.6	3.6	4.9	5.8	9.6	2.0	1.4	2.4
Nebraska	5.7	1.0	1.0	2.3	1.0	.8	.9	.9	3.4
Nevada	59.7	50.2	26.9	38.5	16.1	1.0	2.9	14.7	6.2
New Hampshire	4.0	.8	.3	.0	.6	2.3	.3	.5	4.1
New Jersey	39.0	53.2	45.3	34.9	26.7	29.9	32.1	30.8	46.4
New Mexico	164.7	181.4	152.6	133.8	77.5	124.8	113.9	99.8	122.2
New York	194.5	177.7	186.1	159.1	164.6	152.2	122.1	89.0	113.6
North Carolina	6.8	36.6	40.0	25.7	20.5	27.4	30.4	38.0	7.7
North Dakota	7.4	5.5	5.8	4.9	1.5	3.7	3.2	2.3	1.1
Ohio	122.2	64.1	128.1	147.5	67.5	49.7	91.2	108.1	68.7
Oklahoma	4.1	1.0	1.9	2.8	3.2	6.7	2.6	7.8	3.5
Oregon	1.8	13.8	6.5	5.2	8.1	5.9	3.2	8.9	4.0
Pennsylvania	52.0	95.7	72.2	35.4	51.3	40.8	17.9	28.0	63.3
Rhode Island	1.9	.6	.6	7.3	3.9	4.6	9.7	15.4	2.9
South Carolina	4.1	4.9	14.7	2.7	2.2	10.3	1.0	18.5	18.2
South Dakota	1.5	1.0	5.6	4.3	3.0	.4	.6	.2	2.2
Tennessee	48.1	29.5	77.4	37.1	22.9	38.7	28.8	135.4	128.9
Texas	465.7	429.1	56.6	84.2	56.5	62.8	35.8	44.1	2,014.2
Utah	1.5	3.5	6.7	4.6	2.6	2.8	1.5	1.2	1.8
Vermont0	.1	.6	.0	2.2	.5	.1	.5	2.1
Virginia	172.4	131.0	126.6	81.1	69.7	56.6	53.7	61.3	60.6
Washington	54.3	71.6	71.5	64.3	71.8	64.8	12.1	14.9	12.1
West Virginia	9.7	8.4	4.8	5.4	2.6	2.8	12.6	25.0	18.4
Wisconsin	10.2	8.0	24.6	9.6	3.0	2.0	1.1	3.2	10.5
Wyoming	1.8	.6	1.8	1.5	.5	.6	.7	.3	.9

See explanatory information, if any, and SOURCE at end of table.

**Table C-111a. Federal obligations for R&D plant for selected agencies, by State:
fiscal years 1992-2000**

[Dollars in millions]

Page 2 of 2

State	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Outlying areas	6.9	13.1	0.5	1.4	8.3	4.3	3.1	7.5	5.6
Puerto Rico	NA	NA	.4	.3	.3	.4	2.2	1.3	3.2
Other areas	NA	NA	-	1.1	8.1	3.9	.9	6.2	2.4
Offices abroad6	.6	.7	1.3	.5	.3	3.9	.5	.7

KEY: - = Amount less than 50 thousand dollars
NA = Not applicable (indicates that the data collected for this table were not recorded at that level in that particular fiscal year)

NOTES: Because of rounding, detail may not add to totals.

For each year, the data shown include the obligations of the 10 major R&D-supporting agencies which were required to report to this section of the survey in that year, and represent 96 percent or more of the total Federal R&D obligations in that year.

Although the nongeographic historical tables incorporate corrections to previously reported data that have been submitted by the reporting agencies, corresponding corrections to the geographic distributions are rarely obtainable.

Geographic distribution of Department of Defense development funding to industry reflects only the location of prime contractors, not the numerous subcontractors who perform most of the research and development.

Beginning in fiscal year 2000, the National Aeronautics & Space Administration reclassified Space Station as a physical asset and Space Station Research as equipment, and transferred funding for the program from R&D to R&D plant.

SOURCE: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Federal Funds for Research and Development: Fiscal Years 2000, 2001, and 2002